

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been obviated by revising these claims to make it clear that the surface hardness of the blade dowel is always selected to be higher than the surface hardness of the blade arm within the recited ranges of hardnesses set forth in these claims. Further, both claims have been amended to make it clear that the blade arm and the blade dowel are each subjected to chemical polishing. Further, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to recite that the material of the blade dowel is one of a three-cutting stainless steel and a carbon tool steel. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

Finally, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been obviated by the filing of a certified English translation of the priority document upon which this U.S. patent application is based, as well as a “Petition for Correction of Inventorship” which adds Mr. Takao Ogawa as an inventor to the present application. Since the filing of the certified English translation establishes a priority filing date for this application of April 22, 2003, as the Miyazaki ‘787 published patent application has a later U.S. filing date of August 25, 2003, it is no longer prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). And while the Ichinose ‘976 published patent application still has an earlier filing date of October 25, 2002, the addition of Mr. Takao Ogawa as an inventor to the present application renders the inventorship between the ‘976 published patent application and the present application the same. As §102(e) requires that the invention be described in a published patent application “by another” filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, in as this condition is no longer present, the Ichinose ‘976 patent is no longer a reference under §102(e). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) on the basis of the Miyazaki ‘787 and Ichinose ‘976 published patent applications should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The “Petition for Correction of Inventorship” is accompanied by the signed Declarations of all the inventors of the present application with the exception of Mr. Ichinose, who was unavailable at the time his particular Declaration was drafted. Applicant’s attorney will forward a signed version of Mr. Ichinose’s Declaration within the next two weeks.

U.S. Serial No. 10/827,423
Amendment
Response to 10-3-05

Atty. Docket No. 740186-31

Now that claims 1 and 2 are in patentable condition, the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due is hereby earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any overage or shortage of fees connected with filing of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas W. Cole
Thomas W. Cole
Registration No. 28,290

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Customer No. 22204
401 9th Street, N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000
(202) 585-8080 fax

TWC/lms